

**IMPACT FEES**

FOR

**EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES**

IN

**LAKE COUNTY, FLORIDA**

Henderson  
Young &  
Company

February 14, 2007

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>1. INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2. NEXUS OF BENEFITS OF EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES.....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>3. COSTS OF EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES PER STUDENT .....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>4. COSTS OF EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES PER DWELLING UNIT .....</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>5. IMPACT FEE PER DWELLING UNIT .....</b>	<b>28</b>

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Current Enrollment Compared to Current Capacity.....	7
Table 2: Enrollment Growth and Student Stations Needed Next Five Years .....	8
Table 3: Permanent Schools Cost Per Student Station .....	14
Table 4: Land and Off-Site Costs per Student Station .....	15
Table 5: Ancillary Facility Costs per Student Station .....	18
Table 6: School Bus Costs per Student Station .....	20
Table 7: Total Educational Facility Costs per Student Station .....	21
Table 8: Capital Cost of Existing Deficiency and Future Growth .....	22
Table 9: Public School Students per Dwelling Unit .....	26
Table 10: Public School Cost per Dwelling Unit .....	27
Table 11: 5-Year Revenue Available For Additional Capacity .....	30
Table 12: Revenue Credit Percent .....	31
Table 13: Impact Fees .....	31

# 1. INTRODUCTION

## **Purpose of This Study**

This study of impact fees for educational facilities in Lake County, Florida presents the methodology, summarizes the data, and explains the calculation of the fees. The methodology is designed to comply with the requirements of Florida law.

## **Definition and Rationale of Impact Fees**

Impact fees are charges paid by new development to reimburse local governments and school boards for the capital cost of public facilities that are needed to serve new development and the people who occupy the new development.

Local governments and school boards charge impact fees on either of two bases. First, as a matter of policy and legislative discretion, they may want new development to pay the full cost of its share of new public facilities because that portion of the facilities would not be needed except to serve the new development. In this case, the new development is required to pay for all the cost of its share of new public facilities.

On the other hand, local governments and school boards may use other sources of revenue to pay for the new public facilities that are required to serve new development. If, however, such revenues are not sufficient to cover the entire costs of new facilities necessitated by new development, the new development may be required to pay an impact fee in an amount equal to the difference between the total cost and the other sources of revenue.

There are many kinds of "public facilities" that are needed by new development, including schools, roads, water and sewer plants, parks, and other government facilities. This study covers schools and other educational facilities in Lake County, Florida.

New development is synonymous with "growth". For some impact fees, new development includes new residential, retail, office, commercial, industrial and all other new construction. Impact fees for educational facilities, however, are charged only to new residential development: houses, apartments, mobile home parks, and other residential construction. Non-residential new development is not charged school impact fees, as explained in chapter 3.

## **Rules Governing Impact Fees in Florida**

Impact fees for educational facilities have been upheld by the Florida Supreme Court. In addition, judicial decisions regarding impact fees for other public facilities also apply to the imposition of impact fees for schools.

Several court cases<sup>1</sup> provide direction in three broad areas of the development of impact fees: (1) who pays, and how much (the "fair share" rules), (2) where and how the fee can be used (the dual "nexus of benefit" rules), and (3) offsets against the fee (the "credits" rules).

First, the "fair share" rules require that impact fees can be charged only for the portion of the cost of public capital facilities that is attributable to new development. Impact fees cannot be charged to pay for the cost of reducing or eliminating deficiencies in existing facilities. Within this broad rule, specific guidance is given in several areas:

- It is permitted to distinguish among the impacts of different types of growth in establishing fee amounts (i.e., single family homes can be shown to have different impacts than multi-family dwelling units or mobile homes, therefore the impact fees for each type of dwelling can be different than the other types),
- Fee-payers should be able to pay a smaller fee if they can demonstrate that their development will have less impact than is presumed in the calculation of the impact fee schedule for their classification of property (i.e., through land use restrictions), and
- Costs of facilities that will be used by new development and existing users must be apportioned between the two groups in determining the amount of the fee.

---

<sup>1</sup> In St. Johns County V. Northeast Florida Builders Association, 583 So. 2d 635 (Fla. 1991) the Florida Supreme Court ruled that new development can be required to pay school impact fees. Volusia County v. Aberdeen at Ormond Beach, L.P., 760 So. 2d 126 (Fla. 2000) addressed the applicability of school impact fees to housing for senior citizens. The following five significant court cases also guide the development of impact fees in Florida: Contractors and Builders Association of Pinellas County v. City of Dunedin, 329 So.2d 314 (Fla. 1976); Hollywood, Inc. v. Broward County, 431 So.2d 606 (Fla. 4th DCA 1983); Home Builders and Contractors Association of Palm Beach County, Inc. v. Board of County Commissioners of Palm Beach County, 446 So.2d 140 (Fla. 4th DCA 1983); and Seminole County v. City of Casselberry, 541 So.2d 666 (Fla. 5th DCA 1989); City of Ormond Beach v. County of Volusia, 535 So.2d 302 (Fla. 5th DCA 1968). The Local Government Comprehensive Planning and Land Development Regulation Act also touches on some aspects of impact fees.

Second, the dual "nexus of benefit" rules require a demonstrated reasonable connection (1) between the need for public capital facilities and the growth from the fee-paying development, and (2) between the expenditure of fee revenue and the benefits received by the fee-paying development. These two conditions limit where and when impact fees can be collected and used.

There are many ways that the nexus of benefit can be established, including personal use and use by others in the family (direct benefit), use by persons who provide goods or services to the fee-paying property (indirect benefit), and geographical proximity (presumed benefit). The connections among needs, benefits and fees will vary according to the type of facility; schools will have different nexus of benefits criteria than roads. The nexus of benefit for schools will be based on the average number of public school students per dwelling unit. A detailed description of this data is presented later in this study.

Another connection among needs, benefits and fees can be the geographical relationship between a fee-paying development and the impact on a public capital facility . Some impact fees for roads or parks use geographical zones for calculating, collecting and spending impact fees. In the St. Johns County case, the Florida Supreme Court identified the constitutional requirement of "a uniform system of free public schools" (Article IX, Section 1, Florida Constitution), as a reason that school impact fees can be a uniform countywide system, therefore zones will not be used for Lake County's updated school impact fee.

Furthermore, the fee revenue must be expended within a reasonable period of time, but there is no single maximum limit that applies to all impact fee expenditures. Explicit limitations on the expenditure of fees must be adequate to guide government personnel, and fee revenue must be earmarked for specific uses related to the public capital facilities for which the impact fee is charged.

Finally, the "credits" rules allow a fee-payer to have an impact fee reduced to reflect (1) contributions of land, cash, facilities, or other assets that meet the same need as the fee, and (2) future payments of taxes that would ordinarily be used for the same public capital facilities for which the impact fee is being charged. Without such credits, the fee-paying development might pay more than its fair share. Court cases and legislation do not prohibit a local government or school board from establishing reasonable constraints on determining credits. For example, the location, quality and design of a donated public facility should conform to adopted local standards for such facilities.

## **Data Sources**

The data in this study of impact fees for educational facilities in Lake County, Florida was provided by staff of Lake County Public Schools, unless a different source is specifically cited. Source documents and staff resources are listed for each table of data in the following study.

Pursuant to F.S. 163.31801 (3) (a), "... the calculation of the impact fee [is required to] be based on the most recent and localized data." In order to fulfill this requirement, this impact fee rate study used the most recent data available from Lake County Public Schools at the time the research was assembled and analyzed for this impact fee rate study. Data in one table came from another source because the other source of data is the most recent and localized data that also fulfills the requirements of case law for impact fees. Specifically, the student generation rates in Table 9 are based on 2000 U.S. Census data for Lake County because no other source of data measures the student population by type of dwelling unit for all dwelling units and all school age population in the district. The student generation rate by school level for different types of dwelling units is used to quantify the nexus between dwelling units and costs per student stations. Other data sources do not contain the combination of dwelling unit type and school age population for the entire County that is available from the Public Use Microdata Sample of the U.S. Census.

## **Data Rounding**

The data in this study was prepared using computer spreadsheet software. In some tables in this study, there will be very small variations from the results that would be obtained using a calculator to compute the same data. The reason for these insignificant differences is that the spreadsheet software was allowed to calculate results to more places after the decimal than is reported in the tables of these reports. The calculation to extra places after the decimal increases the accuracy of the end results, but causes occasional differences due to rounding of data that appears in this study.

## 2. NEXUS OF BENEFITS OF EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES

As described in the introduction, there must be a dual nexus between the benefits of educational facilities and new development that is charged an impact fee to pay for a portion of the educational facilities that it needs. This chapter is devoted to an analysis of the nexus.

There are several considerations that affect the "rational nexus of benefits" for educational facility impact fees: (A) responsibility for schools, (B) the need for new educational facilities for new development, (C) the type of property that receives the benefits from new educational facilities, and (D) the location of the property in relation to the new educational facilities.

### **A. Responsibility for Schools.**

The County-wide Lake County Public School system presently consists of 23 elementary schools of which 2 are conversion charter school facilities, 9 middle schools, 7 high schools, and 1 school facility that houses grade 9. There is also 1 alternative program school as well as 3 adult/evening class schools including 2 sites for the Institute of Public Safety, and 242,202 square feet of ancillary facilities.

The School Board of Lake County is legally and financially responsible for the County-wide public school system, therefore the analysis of growth's impact on public schools includes all of the County-wide public school system: no portion of the County or any City in the County is excluded. However, the only charter schools the School Board is responsible for providing capital facilities are conversion charter schools. All other charter schools are responsible for securing their own space, equipment and personnel. Non-conversion charter schools are not included in the inventory of capacity and current enrollment because the district is not responsible for providing facilities to these schools.

The School Board of Lake County is not responsible for private schools or home schooling. The County cannot control access to or usage of schools operated by private organizations or individuals, therefore such facilities are excluded from the analysis of impact fees for educational facilities. The multiplier used later in this study in the formula for calculating impact fees is "*public* school students per dwelling unit." The multiplier excludes students who attend private schools or home schools, thereby insuring that the impact fee is based on the need for *public* educational facilities.

## **B. The Need for New Educational Facilities for New Development**

Lake County Public Schools, like most school systems, determines its need for educational facilities by comparing its standards for the capacity of various educational facilities to the number of students that it must serve. Local school district standards are based on capacity standards in State Requirements for Educational Facilities (SREF) issued by the Florida Department of Education (FDOE) as applied in local “Educational Plant Surveys.”<sup>2</sup>

Table 1 compares the current student stations for grades PreK-12 to the current enrollment (December, 2005) for grades PreK-12 within the Lake County Public School System. The student station counts are based on permanent student stations and do not include relocatables because state law calls for phasing out and eventual elimination of relocatable facilities. The current inventory of student stations is adjusted to reflect implementation of the 2002 voter-approved Constitutional amendment that mandates specific reduced class sizes.

The permanent student stations in Table 1 has been adjusted by a “utilization factor” to determine the operational capacity of the elementary, middle and high schools for grades PreK-12. Operational capacity is a percentage of the permanent student stations that provides for the efficient and effective usage of a school for the educational program at each school. There are several factors that cause the operational capacity to be less than the theoretical capacity, such as grade level restrictions, course enrollment restrictions, special and/or restrictive course equipment, size and design of the space available, and the demographics of the school and community. The Lake County School District’s operational capacity is 100% for elementary schools, 89.98% for middle and 93.64% for high schools<sup>3</sup>. The capacity data in Table 1 is based on Lake County Schools’ actual student capacity at each school. The use of operational capacity adjustments is a standard practice in Florida schools, and is based on guidelines in SREF developed by the Florida Department of Education.

The comparison of the current student capacity to the current student enrollment in Table 1 illustrates that there is a system-wide shortage at elementary, middle and high schools with the largest shortage at the elementary

---

<sup>2</sup> Lake County’s Educational Plant Survey was adopted by the School Board January 12, 2004, and approved by FDOE April 2, 2004.

<sup>3</sup> Lake County’s middle and high school operational capacity of 89.98% for middle schools and 93.64% for high schools is the weighted average of the actual utilization of all middle school and high school space in Lake County middle and high schools. Individual campus operational capacities may vary.



schools<sup>4</sup>. It should be noted that this district-wide analysis is the sum of localized deficiencies and surpluses, and it understates the true need because it uses surplus capacity in specific schools to offset shortages in other schools. In reality, the permanent capacity is in fixed locations and cannot be applied to other locations because the permanent facilities are not relocatable and it is not feasible to bus students extended distances to the locations where surplus capacity exists.

***Table 1: Current Enrollment Compared to Current Capacity***

	Elementary Schools	Middle Schools	High Schools	Total
Permanent Student Stations (November, 2005)	14,247	8,994	10,984	34,225
Additional Fully Funded Student Stations Under Construction				
Less Student Stations Not Available After 2005				
Long Term Permanent Student Stations	14,247	8,994	10,984	34,225
Utilization Factor	100%	89.98%	93.64%	
Net Long Term Permanent Capacity	14,247	8,093	10,285	32,625
November, 2005 Enrollment				
K-12	16,820	8,391	10,351	35,562
ESE PreK	165			165
Regular PreK	551			551
Total Enrollment	17,536	8,391	10,351	36,278
Capacity Reserve/(Shortage)	(3,289)	(298)	(66)	(3,653)

Source: School F.I.S.H Capacities.xls (4/17/06); Lake County Schools December 2005 Student Enrollment  
A2currentstudentenrollment\_byse.xls, 11-21-05, updated for PreK 5/12/06.

The rate of growth in enrollment in the Lake County Public Schools has been substantial. Between 1998/99 and 2004/05 enrollment increased by 31%. The annual rate of growth during this six year period has been steadily increasing from 3.6% between 1998/99 and 1999/00 and 5.4% between 2003/04 and 2004/05.

<sup>4</sup> Lake County Public Schools, like many other districts, has overcome the shortage on permanent facilities by using “portables” (“relocatables”). As noted previously, state law calls for the elimination of portables, thus the analysis in this study is based on permanent educational facilities.

The Lake County Public Schools enrollment projections indicate there will be about 46,782 PreK-12 students in the public schools by 2010-11, which equals an average annual growth rate of 5.08% from the beginning of the 2004/05 school year. (Note: the forecasts are made using the cohort survival method, which is more accurate than simple percentage increases in growth. For ease of understanding, the results of the cohort survival method are reported here as though they had been calculated by an average annual growth rate of 5.08%.)<sup>5</sup>

Table 2 shows the impact of projected growth on Lake County's school facilities. The data illustrate the increase in enrollment during the next 5 years and quantifies the need for construction of new schools to accommodate the students from new dwelling units. District-wide, the Lake County Public Schools will need 11,064 student stations for the additional enrollment in the next five years.

**Table 2: Enrollment Growth and Student Stations Needed Next Five Years**

	Elementary School	Middle School	High School	Total
Projected 2010 Enrollment				
K-12	20,920	11,269	13,877	46,066
ESE PreK	165			165
Regular PreK	551			551
Total Projected 2010 Enrollment	21,636	11,269	13,877	46,782
November, 2005 Enrollment	17,536	8,391	10,351	36,728
Projected Growth Next 5 Years	4,100	2,878	3,526	10,504
Utilization Adjustment <sup>6</sup>	100%	111.1%	106.8%	
Student Stations Needed 2005-2010	4,100	3,198	3,765	11,064

Source: E. LCSD forecast of enrollment 4-12-06 as modified 5-12-06 to include PreK; Lake County Schools December 2005 Student Enrollment A2currentstudentenrollment\_bysc.xls, 11-21-05, updated for PreK 5/12/06; Utilization Adjustment calculated by consultant using Lake County Public Schools F.I.S.H.CAPACITIES.xls, 4-17-06.

<sup>5</sup> Adjusting the District's enrollment to exclude regular PreK allows comparison with the FDOE forecasts (FDOE forecasts only include ESE PreK). The adjusted district annual growth rate of 5.13% is slightly lower than FDOE's enrollment forecast (which is the equivalent of 5.26% per year). Both sources (school district and FDOE) support the conclusion that enrollment will grow in the future. This study uses the school district forecast because it has been the most accurate predictor of future enrollment, and because it is the most conservative growth rate.

<sup>6</sup> The Utilization Adjustment is used to forecast the number of student stations that need to be built so that there will be enough space to house the full enrollment, after taking into account the operational capacity losses described elsewhere in this study. For example, if there will be 2,878 more middle school students, and middle schools operate at 89.98% operational capacity, there is a need for 3,197 student stations to serve the 2,878 students (i.e.,  $2,878 \div 89.98\% = 3,197$ ). The Utilization Adjustment factor in Table 2 is calculated by dividing 1 by the operational capacity percent (i.e.,  $1 \div 89.98\% = 111.1\%$ ).

### **C. Types of Property Benefiting from New Educational Facilities;**

Impact fees are charged to properties which benefit from new educational facilities. Lake County Public Schools are used, for the most part, by individuals rather than businesses or other non-residential land uses. There is insufficient data to objectively allocate the value of the indirect benefit of the school system to non-residential property. Impact fees for educational facilities are charged only to residential development because the dominant stream of benefits redounds to the occupants of dwelling units<sup>7</sup>.

### **D. Location of Property Receiving Benefits from New Educational Facilities**

As described earlier, a nexus of benefits is required between a new dwelling unit and the new educational facilities that are built with the impact fees paid by the new dwelling unit. One method of connecting a house and a school would be to establish impact fee "zones" within the school district. All impact fees paid by new houses in the zone would be required to be spent on new educational facilities in the same zone.

There are several reasons that the use of zones is inappropriate for school impact fees in Lake County. First, the construction of a new school benefits dwelling units that are not in the adjacent area because the new school relieves overcrowding in other schools, which is a significant benefit for those other schools. Each time a new school is constructed, its attendance area boundaries have a ripple effect on the existing attendance areas of neighboring schools.

Second, some facilities and programs of the school district are used for students throughout the district, which makes the use of zones virtually meaningless. There are a variety of magnet and specialty programs offered throughout the district. For example, there are school facilities providing exceptional programs and alternative program schools serving students on a systemwide basis. This means that students from a dwelling unit that paid an impact fee may actually attend a facility in another part of the County. Conversely, a new school that is nearest a new dwelling unit may serve some students from other parts of the County.

Third, the Lake County Public Schools presently bus just under 20,400 students to schools located throughout the County. Busing is usually provided for

---

<sup>7</sup> Residential property that is deed-restricted for occupancy by senior citizens is exempt from paying school impact fees.

one of several reasons: special education students traveling to centralized facilities, state mandated transportation for students who live more than 2 miles from their school, court-ordered or voluntary busing to achieve racial balance, or students transported to magnet programs. A student who is transported to an educational facility that is some distance from his/her dwelling unit is most directly benefited by the educational facility that he/she attends. The educational facility that is nearest his/her dwelling unit may provide little direct benefit to his/her dwelling unit.

Finally, the Florida Supreme Court ruled in the St. Johns County case that "substantially all" of the population of municipalities must join with the unincorporated population in paying educational facility impact fees in order to conform to the constitutional requirement of "a *uniform system* of free public schools" (Article IX, Section 1, Florida Constitution, emphasis added). The use of zones of any kind, whether municipal, school attendance boundaries, or some other basis, conflicts with the ability of the School Board to provide reasonable uniformity in public school physical plant and facilities.

### 3. COSTS OF EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES PER STUDENT

The first step in determining the impact fee for educational facilities is to prorate the cost of various school facilities among the enrollment capacity (i.e., student stations) of the facilities. The cost per student is calculated using Formula 1:

$$1. \quad \frac{\text{Cost of Educational Facility}}{\text{Student Capacity of Educational Facility}} = \text{Cost per Student}$$

There are three variables used in formula 1: (A) the types and levels of educational facilities, (B) the costs of each type and level of educational facility, and (C) the student capacity of each type and level of educational facility.

#### **Variable (A) Types and Levels of Educational Facilities**

There are three types of educational facilities in Lake County: schools, ancillary facilities, and transportation (school busses).

The Lake County Public Schools are structured by grade level: elementary schools serve Pre-kindergarten through 5th grade, middle schools serve grades 6 through 8, and high schools serve grades 9 through 12. Schools at each level are designed to meet different educational needs for different numbers of students; therefore, each level is analyzed separately in this study. Permanent facilities are the basis for impact fees, but portables are not because Florida law provides for reduction and eventual elimination of portables.

Support facilities that are not located at schools, such as maintenance, storage, transportation and administrative facilities, are called "ancillary" facilities. The cost per student of ancillary facilities is calculated separately from other types of educational facilities. Support facilities that are located at schools, such as cafeterias and principals' offices, are called "auxiliary" facilities. The cost of auxiliary facilities are included in the cost of schools, and are not analyzed separately.

School busses are the capital component of Lake County Public Schools' transportation system, and are analyzed as a separate element of the impact fee.

## **Variable (B) Costs of Educational Facilities**

The cost of each new educational facility includes design, buildings, equipment and furniture, and site improvements. In addition, costs are calculated for land for the school site, ancillary facilities (district-level support facilities) and busses.

Some of the additional capacity in educational facilities will be provided by constructing new facilities, however some capacity may be provided by expanding existing facilities. Throughout this study, any reference to new educational facilities includes expansion of existing facilities as well as construction of new facilities.

## **Variable (C) Students per Educational Facility**

The impact of new development on educational facilities is computed on the basis of statistical standards (i.e., students per classroom, school, or school bus, according to the type of educational facility). The standards define the capacity of the educational system that is required to serve each student enrolled in the Lake County Public Schools. As noted in Chapter 2, the standards used by Lake County Public Schools are set by the School Board, and appear in the adopted Educational Plant Survey.

## **Cost per Student Station: Tables and Data**

The balance of this chapter contains a series of tables and accompanying text that documents and calculates the cost per student of educational facilities. Tables 3 through 6 document each type of educational facility cost: permanent schools student stations, borrowing cost to build educational facilities, land and off-site costs, ancillary facilities, and transportation (school busses). Where appropriate, the tables include a separate column of data for each educational level: elementary, middle, and high school.

Table 7 lists the results from Tables 3 through 6 and adds them together to calculate the total capital cost of educational facilities per student station .

### **Permanent Schools Cost per Student Station**

The permanent school building cost per student station for elementary, middle and high school students is shown in Table 3.

The cost of schools in Section A of Table 3 is based on Lake County Public Schools' most recent school construction projects: Elementary H, I, K, Minneola Charter Elementary, Middle School DDD, East Ridge High School Classrooms, and South Lake High School Classrooms. Costs are the full cost of the school, including design, site preparation, construction materials, labor costs, contractor's pre-construction services, contractor's fees, contractor's risk, builder's risk insurance, performance bond, furniture, technology and equipment, utility connection fees, printing & signage, permitting and construction inspection and testing. The costs do not include land costs (which are analyzed separately in this study) or off-site improvements (which are not included in this study). The only costs available for high schools are classroom additions, and these costs have been adjusted to include a core facility factor based on the District's Educational Plant Survey in order to reflect the true total cost per student station on the same basis as the elementary and middle school projects that are for new schools that include all core facilities.

### **Borrowing Cost per Student**

Many school districts borrow money to build new schools and to add capacity at existing schools. The cost of borrowing money is the interest that the school district pays the lender. Lake County Public Schools has historically borrowed money to pay for new school capacity, and the District's capital improvement plan includes borrowing to finance future school capacity, therefore borrowing costs are included in the cost basis for calculating impact fee rates.

There are two components to the cost of borrowing: how much money is borrowed, and interest rates. The amount to be borrowed is based on the District's adopted 5-year work plan, and the interest rate is based on the average of all six of the District's debt issues (bonds and certificates of participation) from 1991 through 2005.

Table 3 shows the borrowing cost per student station. In Section B, the amount to be borrowed is calculated by multiplying the local cost per student station (from Section A) by the percentage of the cost of capacity projects that are currently under construction that the Lake County Public Schools will pay for with borrowed money. As shown in Table 3, forty percent (40.47%) of the costs for the elementary school capacity projects currently under construction are financed with borrowed money. This percentage of costs paid for with borrowed money is 77.81% for middle schools, and 78.83% for high schools. The portion borrowed is based on a detailed analysis of all schools build since 2002, including the portions paid with borrowed money and the portions paid by cash sources, such as grants , local 2-mill property tax, and impact fees.

In Section C, the amount borrowed per student station (from Section B) is then multiplied by the interest cost per dollar borrowed. The interest cost is based on the latest Certificate of Participation program (issued in 2005). The amount borrowed was \$64,240,000. The amount of interest to be paid is an additional \$64,237,556.69, however the schedule of future interest payments needs to be discounted to net present value because the impact fee that includes the interest cost will be paid at the time the development occurs, but the interest expense will be paid over a period of years until 2030. The net present value of the future interest payments is \$38,144,683.40. Dividing the interest cost of \$38.1 million by the amount borrowed of \$64.2 million shows that there will be \$0.6788 of interest repaid (at net present value) for each dollar borrowed. In Section C, the interest cost is expressed as a percent of the total borrowed (i.e., 67.88% is the same as \$0.6788 per \$1.00 borrowed).

In Section C of Table 3 the interest costs to borrow money to pay for additional student stations ranges from \$6,636.45 for an elementary school student station to \$17,567.08 for a middle school student station.

***Table 3: Permanent Schools Cost Per Student Station***

Cost Items	Elementary	Middle	High
<u>A. Local Cost per Student Station</u>	\$ 24,158	\$ 33,260	\$ 30,101
<u>B. Amount Borrowed</u>			
Percent of Capacity Projects To Be Built With Borrowed Money	40.47%	77.81%	78.83%
Borrowed Amount Per Student Station	9,776.74	25,879.61	23,782.62
<u>C. Interest Cost</u>			
Interest Cost as Percent of Amount Borrowed	67.88%	67.88%	67.88%
Interest Cost per Student Station	6,636.45	17,567.08	16,106.99

Source: Section A - LCSD Cost Stu/Stn 070131. Sections B & C – A6&A7 Actual Cost of Schools Under Co 3-16-06

## **Land and Off-Site Costs Per Student Station**

The land costs per student station are shown in Table 4. The initial data is the site size which represents the number of acres that the Lake County Public School typically requires for a new school for each of the three school types. Next is the land cost per acre to acquire land needed for school buildings, playgrounds/athletic fields, auxiliary facilities, parking and on-site stormwater



retention for the new school. The land cost is based on the average of the price paid by Lake County Public Schools for all elementary, middle and high school sites purchased since 1998.

The typical site size is multiplied by the average cost per acre to calculate the typical cost of land for each of the three school types. This cost is then divided by the standards for student stations for each type of school<sup>8</sup> to calculate the land cost per elementary, middle and high school student station. The final adjustment to the land cost is to account for the portion of land that was donated to the school district (and not as a credit against future impact fees). Such donations represent a reduction of the cost of land. Table 4 shows that 53.59% of elementary school site costs were purchased (and the other 46.41% was donated).

Off-Site costs include improvements that are needed for a school but which are "off campus," such as drainage and road improvements. The Off-Site costs vary significantly according to local circumstances. In order to be conservative, it was decided to not include off-site costs in the impact fee calculation.

The "results" of Table 4 are the land costs to provide one student station in permanent schools.

***Table 4: Land Costs per Student Station***

Cost Items	Elementary	Middle	High
Site Size (acres)	20	40	60
Cost Per Acre	\$ 12,412	\$ 33,687	\$ 24,634
Cost of Land	248,240	1,347,480	1,478,040
Student Stations	934	1,415	2,070
Land Cost per Student Station	\$ 265.78	\$ 952.28	\$ 714.03
Percent of Land Purchased	53.59%	100.00%	100.00%
Purchased Land Cost per Student Station	\$ 142.43	\$ 952.28	\$ 714.03

Source: Lake County Public Schools A13lakeCountySchoolsPropertyInv.xls, as revised 2-21-06

<sup>8</sup> The standards adopted by Lake County Public Schools in its Educational Plant Survey are 934 student stations at new elementary schools, 1,415 student stations at new middle schools, and 2,070 student stations at new high schools. (The inventory of schools operated by Lake County Public Schools contains some schools that have capacities that are different than the standards for new schools because they were built under older, different standards.)

## Ancillary Facility Cost Per Student Station

Ancillary facilities are support facilities that are not located at schools, such as maintenance, storage, transportation and administrative facilities. Table 5 shows the calculation of the cost of ancillary facilities per student station. Ancillary facilities serve the entire student body, therefore the cost per student station is the replacement value per student station of the entire inventory of all ancillary facilities.

The District's ancillary facilities are analyzed in five categories: office space, warehouse space, warehouse and office space, service garage space, and computer center space. because each category has a different construction cost per square foot. For each category, land costs are calculated separately from building costs.

Land costs are calculated by adding the site acreages of each site in a category (i.e., Section A – E), then multiplying the total by the average cost of land. There is no data available for either current or planned ancillary facilities land costs. The average cost per land in Table 5 is derived by adjusting the land cost per acre from the 2004 impact fee study by the percent increase in the FDOE cost per student station from 2004 to 2006. This amounts to a 27.38% increase. The result is the value of the land for each category of ancillary facility.

Building costs are calculated in Sections A – E by adding the square footage of all buildings in a category<sup>9</sup>, then multiplying the total by the average cost per square foot of that category of building. The building costs are based on the MEANS Building Construction Cost Data – 2003 for the Orlando, Florida market, discounted 16.6% to reflect lower construction costs in Lake County. These costs were included in the 2004 impact fee study. For the 2006 update the costs for each category of building have been adjusted by the 27.38% increase in the FDOE cost per student station from 2004 to 2006.

The land and building costs are combined to establish the total value for each category, and the category total values are added together to calculate the grand total value of all ancillary facilities.

The value per student is the pro rata share of the value of the inventory of all ancillary facilities which is calculated in Section F by dividing the grand total value of all ancillary facilities by the total enrollment for 2010 (from Table 2).

In Section G the overall cost per student the cost per student is adjusted to reflect the cost per student station by applying the utilization factors of 100% for

---

<sup>9</sup> The total square footage is adjusted by a factor of 1.258 to calculate the gross square footage. The source of the adjustment factor is FDOE.

elementary school students, 89.89% utilization for middle school students and 93.64% utilization for high school students. The "bottom lines" of Table 5 are the capital costs to provide ancillary facilities for each student station.

**Table 5: Ancillary Facility Costs per Student Station**

Facility	Acres	Total Net Sq. Ft.	Gross Sq. Ft. @1.258	Total Value
<u>A. Office Space</u>				
CV Griffin Education Center	38	58,789	73,957	
District Office	2	18,138	22,818	
Dabney Center	7	46,609	58,634	
Howey Education Center	8	12,166	15,305	
Office Space Total Gross Sq Ft	55		170,713	
Value per Unit of Land & Building	\$ 21,817		\$ 86.93	
Value	1,199,937		14,840,848	\$ 16,040,785
<u>B. Warehouse Space</u>				
Warehouse and Grounds	12	49,688	62,508	
Warehouse Space Total Gross Sq Ft	12		62,508	
Value per Unit of Land & Building	\$ 21,817		\$ 43.05	
Value	261,804		2,690,948	\$ 2,952,753
<u>C. Warehouse &amp; Office Space</u>				
Maintenance Dept. Compound	4			
Warehouse /Office Tot. Gross Sq Ft	4		0	
Value per Unit of Land & Building	\$ 21,817		\$ 49.73	
Value	87,268		0	\$ 87,268
<u>D. Service Garage Space</u>				
Bus Garage	4	40,460	50,899	
Groveland Bus Lot	60	3,000	3,774	
Leesburg Bus Lot	7.4	6,273	7,891	
Service Garage Total Gross Sq Ft	71.4		62,564	
Value per Unit of Land & Building	\$ 21,817		\$ 71.18	
Value	1,557,737		4,453,314	\$ 6,011,050
<u>E. Computer Center Space</u>				
MIS/Data Computer Center	1	7,079	8,905	
Computer Center Total Gross Sq Ft	1		8,905	
Value per Unit of Land & Building	\$ 21,817		\$ 172.89	
Value	21,817		1,539,651	\$ 1,561,469
<u>F. All Ancillary Facilities</u>				
Total Value Ancillary Facilities				\$ 26,652,568
÷ Total Projected Enrollment				46,782
Cost Per Student				\$ 569.72
<u>G. Cost per Student Station</u>				
Elementary: 100% Student Station Utilization				\$ 569.72
Middle School: 89.98% Student Station Utilization				\$ 512.63
High School: 93.64% Student Station Utilization				\$ 533.48

Source: Lake County Public Schools A10InventoryofAncillaryFacilities.xls, 3/13/06 as revised 6/22/06

## School Bus Cost per Student Station

Table 6 shows a series of calculations to calculate the school bus cost per elementary, middle and high school student station.

The vehicle cost is the average current cost to Lake County Public Schools to purchase 65 and 84 passenger busses. The two types of busses have an overall average rated capacity of 75 passengers, however the number of students a bus can carry differs depending on the age of the students (i.e., more students per seat for elementary than for middle and high school students). As a result, the busses can carry an average of 75 elementary students, but only 63 middle school and 50 high school students. Section A calculates the school bus cost per student separately for each school level.

In Section B, the cost per student is divided by the average number of runs per bus per day in order to allocate bus costs among elementary, middle and high schools. In Section C, the apportioned average cost per elementary, middle and high school student is multiplied by the percentage of enrollment at each grade level that rides school busses<sup>10</sup>. The result is the school bus capital cost per student. Finally in Section D the school bus cost per student from Section C is adjusted by the student station utilization factors to determine the school bus cost per student station for each school level, shown at the bottom of Table 6.

---

<sup>10</sup> The percentage of enrollment riding school busses is based on data compiled by Lake County Public Schools comparing ridership and enrollment during the 2005-06 school year.

**Table 6: School Bus Costs per Student Station**

Cost Items	Elementary	Middle School	High School
<u>A. Vehicle Cost per Student Capacity</u>			
Vehicle Cost	\$ 84,974.50	\$ 84,974.50	\$ 84,974.50
÷ Vehicle Capacity (Students)	75	63	50
Vehicle Cost Per Student Capacity	1,132.99	1,348.80	1,699.49
<u>B. Portion of Cost for Grade Level</u>			
Number of Runs per Bus (am or pm)	3	3	3
Apportioned Weighted Average Cost Per Student	377.66	449.60	566.50
<u>C. Vehicle Cost per Student</u>			
Percent of Enrollment Riding Bus	50.14%	71.67%	52.83%
School Bus Capital Cost per Student	189.36	322.23	299.28
<u>D. Vehicle Cost per Student Station</u>			
Adjustment for Student Station Utilization	100.00%	89.98%	93.64%
School Bus Capital Cost per Student Station	\$ 189.36	\$ 289.94	\$ 280.25

Source:email 12/2/05; Lake County Public Schools A18TRANSPORTEDSTUDENTSBYGRADELEVEL.xls; lake County Public Schools A19BUSCAPACITYANDCOST.xls

### **Total Educational Facility Cost per Student Station**

Table 7 repeats the "bottom line" from Tables 3 through 6 and adds those costs to calculate the total capital cost per student station for all of educational facilities components: permanent schools construction, borrowing costs, land, ancillary facilities, and transportation (school busses).

The total cost per student station of educational facilities is the end result of Table 7. It will be used as the beginning point for calculating the cost per dwelling unit in the next chapter.

**Table 7: Total Educational Facility Costs per Student Station**

Cost Items	Elementary	Middle	High
Permanent Facility Construction	\$ 24,158.00	\$ 33,260.00	\$ 30,101.00
Borrowing Cost	6,636.45	17,567.08	16,106.99
Land Cost	142.43	952.28	714.03
Ancillary Facilities	569.72	512.63	533.48
Transportation	189.36	289.94	280.25
Total Cost per Student Station	\$ 31,695.96	\$ 52,581.93	\$ 47,735.75

Source: Tables 3 – 6.

### **Capital Cost of Existing Deficiency and Future Growth**

The data developed in Tables 2 – 7 can be used to calculate the capital cost of the existing deficiency in permanent educational facilities for the existing 2005 enrollment as well as the capital cost of the additional capacity needed by the year 2010 for new development (see Table 8).

The capital cost of the existing deficiency is calculated in Section B by multiplying the total capital cost per student station in Section A (from Table 7) by the 2005 shortage of permanent student stations in Section B (from Table 1).

In Section C, the cost of future growth is calculated by multiplying the number of additional student stations required to serve new development (from Table 2) by the capital cost per student station from Section A.

**Table 8: Capital Cost of Existing Deficiency and Future Growth**

	Elementary School	Middle School	High School	Total
<u>A. Capital Cost per Student Station</u>	\$ 31,695.96	\$ 52,581.93	\$ 47,735.75	
<u>B. Existing Deficiency</u>				
2005 Shortage of Student Stations	(3,289)	(298)	(66)	
Cost of 2005 Shortage	\$104,248,028	\$ 15,679,869	\$ 3,130,625	\$ 123,058,522
<u>C. Future Growth</u>				
2005-2010 Student Stations Needed	4,100	3,198	3,765	
Cost of Additional Capacity Needed by 2010 for New Development	\$129,953,455	\$ 168,182,712	\$ 179,748,225	\$ 477,884,392

Source: Cost per Student from Table 7; Existing Deficiency from Table 1; Future Growth from Table 2.

Lake County Public Schools' 5-year work plan contains a combination of funded and unfunded projects to eliminate the existing deficiency and serve future growth. An analysis of the funding, and the unfunded balance is presented in Chapter 5.

The costs of deficiency and growth in Table 8 are for the exact number of student stations calculated in Tables 1 and 2. These costs are used for calculating the impact fee because they accurately portray growth's proportionate share of future costs. However, the amount of capacity planned in Lake County Public Schools' 5-year work plan do not exactly match the student station needs in Table 8 because the District must build capacity in larger increments than individual student stations. Capacity is built in increments of classrooms, classroom wings, and whole schools. Also, as noted previously, the district-wide sum of localized deficiencies and surpluses understates the true need because small increments of surplus capacity cannot be moved to the location where shortages occur, and it is not feasible to bus students extended distances to the locations where surplus capacity exists.



## 4. COSTS OF EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES PER DWELLING UNIT

The second step in determining the impact fee for educational facilities is to convert the cost per student station to a cost per dwelling unit. The cost per student station is multiplied by the average number of public school student stations per dwelling unit, as adjusted by the student station utilization factors to calculate the average number of public school student stations per dwelling unit. The calculation is performed separately for each level of school and each type of dwelling unit. There are three levels of school: elementary, middle and high school. Each level includes its pro rata share of ancillary facilities and school busses. There are three types of dwelling units: single family, multi-family or mobile home. The cost per dwelling unit is calculated using Formula 2

$$2. \quad \text{Cost per Student Station}_L^{11} \quad \times \quad \text{Student Stations per Dwelling Unit}_T^{12} \quad = \quad \text{Cost per Dwelling Unit}_T$$

There is one new variable used in formula 2: (D) the student stations per dwelling unit.

### **Variable (D) Student Stations per Dwelling Unit**

The number of public school students per dwelling unit is the factor used to convert the cost of schools per student station into cost of schools per dwelling unit. The cost per student station (from Table 7) is multiplied by the number of student stations per dwelling unit to calculate the cost per dwelling unit of each level of educational facility.

Different types of dwelling units typically have different numbers of students that live in them. Generally, single family dwelling units have more students than multi-family dwelling units (i.e., apartments or condominiums) and mobile homes. Throughout this study, the data measuring students per dwelling unit will be applied to three types of housing: single family, multi-family, and mobile home. Furthermore, each type of dwelling unit has a different number of students at each school level (i.e., elementary, middle, and high school). Generally, there are more elementary students than middle or high school students per dwelling unit because elementary schools educate children for more years than middle or high schools.

---

<sup>11</sup> "L" = level of educational facility: elementary, middle, or high school

<sup>12</sup> "T" = type of dwelling unit: single family, multi-family, or mobile home

The impact of each type of dwelling unit on the public schools is calculated by multiplying the cost per student station (for each level of educational facility) by the number of students, as adjusted for the student station utilization factor, in each type of dwelling unit for the same school level.

## **Cost per Dwelling Unit: Tables and Data**

This chapter contains two tables and accompanying text that documents the cost per dwelling unit of educational facilities. Table 9 documents the average number of students from each type of dwelling unit (single family, multi-family or mobile home) that attend Lake County Public Schools' elementary, middle, and high schools and converts this number to the average number of student stations required for each type of dwelling unit. Table 10 uses the number of student stations per dwelling unit from Table 9 to convert Table 7's cost per student station into the cost per dwelling unit.

The US census collects information about population, age and dwelling units. The data includes the number of persons in age groups in different types of dwelling units. The 2000 Census data for Lake County is shown in Section A of Table 9, including the total number of dwelling units in Lake County by type of dwelling and the school age population (ages 5-17) by type of school for each type of dwelling unit. The total single family and mobile home dwelling units from the census are listed, then adjusted to exclude the units that are restricted to persons 55 years old or older through deed restrictions on file with the County. These dwelling units will not generate students and therefore will not require school capacity.

In Section B, the census data is used to calculate the students per dwelling unit. Specifically, the population in age ranges that are comparable to school levels were divided by the number of dwelling units that those populations occupy. For example, Section A shows that 10,974 children ages 5-10 (i.e., elementary school age) lived in 51,720 single family houses in 2000 that were not deed restricted in Lake County in 2000. The result of dividing the number of students by the number of houses is 0.0212, which is the average number of elementary school students per single family home. The process is repeated for middle school and high school students in single family homes, and for all school levels in multi-family and mobile homes.

These census ratios of students per dwelling unit in Section B represent all Lake County school age children in 2000. The actual enrollment in Lake County Public Schools in 2000 was less than the school age population because some students do not attend public schools. In Section C of Table 9 the actual Lake County school enrollment for 2000 for each school level is divided by the total 2000 Census school age population for the same school level (from Section A) to

determine the percent of the school age population that was attending public schools. For example, the 13,851 elementary school students enrolled in Lake County Schools was divided by the 14,719 elementary school age population to calculate that 94.10% were enrolled in Lake County Schools. These percentages are applied to the Census students per dwelling unit in Section B to calculate the Lake County public school students per dwelling unit in Section D.

The final step in determining the public school student stations per dwelling unit is shown in Section E. The public students per dwelling unit from Section D are adjusted by the elementary, middle and high school student station utilization factors (from Table 2) to determine the number of student stations required per type of dwelling unit. For example the single family middle school public students per dwelling unit of 0.0097 (from Section D) is multiplied by the middle school student station utilization factor of 111.1% because one middle school student requires 1.111 student stations due to the operational capacity of a middle school. This results in 0.108 middle school student stations per single family dwelling unit.

**Table 9: Public School Students per Dwelling Unit**

Unit Type	Total Dwelling Units	Elementary School Students	Middle School Students	High School Students	Total School Students
<b>A. Dwelling Units and Student Population</b>					
Single-Family Detached	59,006	10,974	5,897	7,323	24,194
Less Deed Restricted 55+	<u>7,286</u>				
Net Single Family Dwelling Units	51,720				
Multi Family:	12,595	1,876	815	942	3,633
Less Deed Restricted 55+	<u>0</u>				
Net Multi Family Dwelling Units	12,595				
Mobile Home	30,549	1,869	1,023	1,278	4,170
Less Deed Restricted 55+	<u>5,319</u>				
Net Mobile Home Dwelling Units	25,230				
<b>B. Census Students per Dwelling Unit</b>					
Single Family		0.212	0.114	0.142	0.468
Multi-Family		0.149	0.065	0.075	0.288
Mobile Home		0.074	0.041	0.051	0.165
<b>C. Actual Enrollment as % of Census</b>					
Census Enrollment	31,997	14,719	7,735	9,543	
Actual Enrollment	27,721	13,851	6,611	7,259	
Actual as % of Census	86.64%	94.10%	85.47%	76.07%	
<b>D. Public School Students per D.U.</b>					
Single Family		0.200	0.097	0.108	0.405
Multi-Family		0.140	0.055	0.057	0.252
Mobile Home		0.070	0.035	0.039	0.143
<b>E. Public School Student Stations per D.U.</b>					
Utilization Adjustment		100.0%	111.1%	106.8%	
Single Family		0.200	0.108	1.115	0.423
Multi-Family		0.140	0.061	0.061	0.262
Mobile Home		0.070	0.039	0.041	0.149

Source: Section A: 2000 Census Public Use Microdata Sample for Lake County, Florida. Section C, Actual Enrollment from Lake County Public Schools. Sections B and D, and Census Enrollment in Section C calculated from source data in this table. Section E utilization adjustment from Table 2.

The final calculation in establishing the cost per dwelling unit involves multiplying the cost per student station from Table 7 by the number of public school student stations per dwelling unit from Table 9. For example, multiplying the \$31,695.96 cost per elementary school student station (from Table 7) by the 0.200 public elementary school student stations per single family dwelling unit (from Table 9) produces an elementary school cost of \$6,328.68 per single family dwelling unit (see Table 10)<sup>13</sup>. The same formula is applied to each combination of elementary, middle and high schools and single family, multi family and mobile homes. The resulting costs per dwelling unit are listed in the rest of Table 10.

***Table 10: Public School Cost per Dwelling Unit***

Housing Type	Elementary School	Middle School	High School	Total
Single Family	\$ 6,328.68	\$ 5,694.69	\$ 5,490.41	\$ 17,513.78
Multi-family	4,442.64	3,231.89	2,900.19	10,574.73
Mobile Homes	2,209.52	2,025.14	1,964.21	6,198.88

Source: Tables 7 and 9.

---

<sup>13</sup> As noted in the Introduction to this study, the data was prepared using computer spreadsheet software. In some tables in this study, there will be very small variations from the results that would be obtained using a calculator to compute the same data.

## 5. IMPACT FEE PER DWELLING UNIT

The final step in determining the impact fee for educational facilities is to reduce the cost per dwelling unit by subtracting any credits for other revenues from existing and new development that the School Board will use to pay for part of the cost of new educational facilities. The impact fee per dwelling unit is calculated using Formula 3:

$$\begin{array}{rcccl} 3. & \text{Cost per Dwelling} & - & \text{Credit for Other} & = & \text{Impact Fee per} \\ & \text{Unit} & & \text{Revenues} & & \text{Dwelling Unit} \end{array}$$

There is one new variable used in formula 3: (E) credits for payment of other revenue.

### Variable (E) Credits for Payments of Other Revenue

New development will be given credit for future payments of other revenues that are used to pay for the same new educational facilities that are required to serve the new development. Credits are not given for payment of taxes paid prior the effective date of this impact fee because those taxes were accounted for in the calculation of the existing impact fee for educational facilities that is being updated by this rate study.

Credits are *not* given for other payments that are *not* used for new educational facilities needed for new development. Such a credit would extend to payments of all taxes for all purposes to all forms of governments, which contradicts the well-established system of restricting fees, charges, and many taxes for specific public facilities and services<sup>14</sup>.

The only revenue sources to be credited are those which are used for school capacity expansion according to law and local policy or practice. Credits are not given for revenues that are used for repair, maintenance or operating costs because impact fees are not used for such expenses.

---

<sup>14</sup> An example of this principle is found in the impact fee statutes for the State of Washington. In the following statute, a "system improvement" is a capital improvement that can be financed by impact fees. RCW 82.02.060(1)(b) requires a credit to be given for "...payments made or reasonably anticipated to be made by new development to pay for particular system improvements in the form of user fees, debt service payments, taxes, or other payments *earmarked for or proratable to the particular system improvement* (emphasis added);"

## **Revenue Credits and Impact Fee: Tables and Data**

The balance of this chapter contains a series of tables and accompanying text that documents and calculates the credits for other payments and calculation of the impact fee for educational facilities.

Table 11 identifies the amount of revenue available to pay for additional capacity for new development based on Lake County Schools capital plan. Table 12 is the calculation of the credit percentage adjustment based on a comparison of the revenue available to pay for additional capacity for new development from Table 11 to the cost of added capacity for new development from Table 8. Table 13 lists the cost per dwelling unit from Table 10, the credit adjustment from Table 12 and calculates the resulting impact fee.

The 5-year forecast of revenue shown in Section A of Table 11 is from Lake County Public Schools' 5-year capital revenue summary. In addition, it includes the 2006-07 special appropriation of \$26.7 million for Classrooms for Kids for compliance with the Constitutional amendment for smaller class size. The revenue includes all sources of revenue for capital outlay, repair, renovation, vehicles, debt service and new capital facilities, except revenue from impact fees because this rate study calculates a new impact fee rate. These revenues total \$349,509,081 over the five years.

Section B of Table 11 begins by listing the cost of the 5-year capital plan for non-capacity projects (no student stations are created), and debt service obligations<sup>15</sup>. These projects total \$161.2 million for the five years. In addition, replacement and capacity projects needed to serve existing enrollment total \$89.6 million. These projects replace obsolete or significantly dilapidated schools and portables. And the cost of additional capacity to eliminate deficiencies from Table 8 is \$123.1 million. The combined cost of these projects that do not serve growth is \$373.9 million. This cost exceeds the \$349.5 million revenues from Section A. The result is a deficit of \$24.4 million, therefore there is no money available from other sources of revenue to pay for a portion of the cost of increased capacity to serve new development for the next 5 years.

---

<sup>15</sup> Debt service costs are considered as not providing capacity for new development because the schools that were built with the proceeds of the debt instruments was included in Table 1, which shows a current deficiency of capacity, thus indicating that the capacity has been consumed, and is not available to serve new development. The taxes that are paid by old and new development to pay off the debt service are a duty of citizenship as taxpayers, and not a revenue credit towards the cost of additional capacity that will serve new development.

**Table 11: 5-Year Revenue Available For Additional Capacity**

Revenue and Cost	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	5-Year Total
<b>A. SOURCE OF FUNDS</b>						
Local Capital Outlay Levy	27,066,690	29,502,692	32,157,934	35,052,148	38,206,842	161,986,306
Sales Tax (1/3 cent surtax)	10,462,474	11,404,097	12,430,465	13,549,207	14,768,636	62,614,879
PECO Maintenance	1,951,570	1,752,475	1,032,619	558,574	1,236,358	6,531,596
PECO Regular	2,446,516	1,932,767	-	-	-	4,379,263
Classrooms for Kids	2,190,827	26,675,596	-	-	-	28,866,423
High Growth Appropriation	6,655,821	-	-	-	-	6,655,821
Capital Outlay & Debt Service	80,000	80,000	80,000	80,000	80,000	400,000
Certificate of Participation	66,000,000	-	-	-	-	66,000,000
Other Misc (including interest)	2,300,000	1,000,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	4,800,000
FY2004-05 Carry Forward	7,274,773	-	-	-	-	7,274,773
Total Revenue for Capital						349,509,081
<b>B. USES OF FUNDS</b>						
Electrical	230,200	260,000	287,000	196,000	309,000	1,282,200
Electronics	245,699	200,000	195,000	175,000	348,000	1,163,699
Flooring	516,704	540,000	450,000	607,000	585,000	2,698,704
HVAC	1,610,316	450,000	425,000	460,000	1,250,000	4,195,316
Painting	199,666	40,000	40,000	45,000	95,000	419,666
Plumbing	208,517	105,000	100,000	125,000	105,000	643,517
Roofing	673,405	350,000	409,560	300,000	500,000	2,232,965
Site Improvement	1,175,768	798,000	850,000	850,000	900,000	4,573,768
Life Safety	-	102,246	100,000	115,000	225,000	542,246
PECO Health & Safety	288,918	160,082	160,082	160,082	160,082	929,246
Technology Renovations	-	55,000	65,000	60,000	65,000	245,000
Other Minor Renovate/Maint.	1,007,940	1,325,172	1,273,100	2,469,607	3,275,059	9,350,878
Busses (replacements)	3,200,000	3,780,000	4,410,000	5,093,550	5,834,460	22,318,010
Minor maintenance/repair	4,222,509	2,633,025	3,322,123	5,004,115	6,580,783	21,762,555
Capital Outlay Equipment	150,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	2,150,000
Transfer to Operating Budget	4,850,000	4,850,000	4,850,000	4,850,000	4,850,000	24,250,000
Debt Service COPs	9,227,585	11,888,484	12,974,304	13,753,299	14,590,417	62,434,089
Rimes PreK	16,946	-	-	-	-	16,946
Replacement/Capacity Projects to Serve Existing Enrollment	see total	see total	see total	see total	see total	89,661,658
Added Capacity to Eliminate Deficiencies	see total	see total	see total	see total	see total	123,058,522
Total Costs Not Available for Capacity for New Development						373,930,365
Balance Available For Capacity for New Development						(24,419,904)

Source: Five Year Capital Revenue Summary FY2006-2010, August 22, 2005; November 14, 2005 Tentative Facility Work Program as revised 22-Apr-05, Schedule 1 and 16



In the next step, the 5-year forecast of other revenue available for added capacity from Table 11 is compared to the cost of added capacity for new development from Table 8. There is no other revenue available for added capacity for new development, therefore there will be 0% of the cost of needed new schools from such sources. In other words, the non-impact fee revenues from Table 11 are not sufficient to pay for maintenance and renovations to the existing school facilities, replacement of capacity for existing enrollment, and elimination of the current deficiency. As a result, there is no revenue for the cost of additional educational facility capacity needed to serve new growth.

***Table 12: Revenue Credit Percent***

Revenue for Added Capacity for New Development	Cost of Added Capacity for New Development	Revenue Credit % (Revenue ÷ Cost)
\$ 0	\$ 477,884,392	0%

Source: Tables 8 and 11

Table 13 shows the cost per dwelling unit from Table 10, the credit of 0%, and the impact fee (rounded down to the nearest dollar in keeping with County practice for impact fees).

***Table 13: Impact Fees***

Housing Type	Full Cost	Credit @ 0.00%	Impact Fee
Single Family	\$ 17,513.78	0.00	\$ 17,513
Multi-family	10,574.73	0.00	10,574
Mobile Homes	6,198.88	0.00	6,198

Source: Tables 10 and 12